REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

As set forth above, no claims have been amended, added or cancelled.

Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent claims. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103:

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application No. 2002/0051466 by Bruckman ("Bruckman") in view of US Patent Application No. 2002/0015422 by Inada et al. ("Inada"). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Previously amended independent claim 1 recites at least the following:

> a variable width-fixed width cipher data packet conversion unit which, if a fixed width is a width of a cipher data packet to be processed in a deciphering process and is a multiple of a variable width, which is a width of an arbitrary cipher data packet input by an arbitrary interface module, the variable width-fixed width cipher data packet conversion unit sequentially receives a number of variable width cipher data packets...

Bruckman, and Inada, taken separately or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose all of the above-recited features of amended independent claim 1. The current Office Action asserts on page 3, first paragraph that "Bruckman describes all of the above-recited features at par. [0027] and par. [0036] - line 13. Applicants traverse for at least the following reasons.

Bruckman is directed to a method and apparatus for transmitting data over a channel using a transmitter that divides data to be transmitted into fragments that vary in width depending on transmission channel conditions and the effective transmission rate (par. [0010]). However, the data width (size) is adjusted differently in Bruckman than in the above-recited claims. For example, the cited portion of Bruckman states, in part:

> When an input packet from one of sources 26 exceeds the determined fragment size, fragmenter 28 divides the packet for transmission into multiple fragments. The *sizes of the fragments are determined by the fragmenter automatically*, as described below, based on the variable rate of transmission of data over channel 25 by a transmitter front end 30 , within bounds dictated by control parameters input by an operator of system 20

(emphasis added).

As seen from the above-cited text, Bruckman describes fragmenter 28 *varying* individual fragment width based on the changing rate of transmission. Accordingly, Bruckman merely describes dividing the packets into fragments.

In contrast to Bruckman, in the above-recited claims, "variable width cipher data packets" recite the variability of data packet width from the I/O ports of various interfaces connected to a device with fixed width I/O ports. Embodiments of the presently claimed invention provide for compatibility between different devices having I/O ports of different width. For example, in embodiments of the presently claimed invention, a user terminal does not need to change widths of the I/O ports, even if external devices with variable width ports are connected to the user terminal. Accordingly, embodiments of the presently claimed invention can combine or separate the data packet width.

Inada is directed to a cryptographic communication system which can reduce the wait time in a decryption apparatus. The Office Action, at page 3, last paragraph, relies on Inada to describe deciphering the received enciphered packets. Accordingly, the Office Action fails to demonstrate how Inada compensates for the above-noted deficiencies of Bruckman.

Independent claim 1 further recites at least the following:

> the variable width-fixed width cipher data packet conversion unit sequentially receives a number of variable width cipher data packets ... the number of which being the same as that of a combination value, which is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width

Bruckman, and Inada, taken separately or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose all of the above-recited features of amended independent claim 1. The current Office Action asserts on page 3, first paragraph that "Bruckman describes all of the above-recited features at pars. [0027] and [0036] - line 13. Applicants traverse the Office Action assertion for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action fails to specifically describe how the cited portions of Bruckman describe a "combination value, which is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width," as recited above. As Applicants assert above, in contrast to the above-recited claims, Bruckman divides data into variable width packets of unequal size as channel constraints vary (par. [0019]). Consequently, Applicants assert that because Bruckman describes variable width packets that have a width that varies according to channel constraints, Bruckman cannot describe a "combination value" as claimed.

In addition, the cited portions of Inada fail to compensate for the deficiencies of Bruckman.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that previously amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Bruckman, and Inada, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by each of the independent claims 7 and 13, with potentially differing scope and breadth, are not suggested or disclosed by Bruckman, and Inada, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 7 and 13 also allowed.

Further, claims 2-6 and 8-12 and 13-18, variously depend from independent claims 1, 7 and 13, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 7 and 13, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Dependent claim 6 recites at least the following features:

> if the deciphering width data is generated, the deciphering width cipher data deciphering unit generates and outputs a deciphering completion signal;

Bruckman and Inada, taken separately or in combination, do not suggest or disclose, at least, all of the above-recited features.

The Office Action asserts at page 6, item 10 that Bruckman describes the above-claimed features at paragraph [0027]. However, the cited paragraph fails to expressly describe a "deciphering completion signal," as recited in dependent claim 6. If the above rejection is to be maintained, Applicants respectfully request the Office provide a more specific rationale supporting the rejection, or specifically indicate if an assertion of inherency is being relied upon. If an assertion of inherency is to be relied upon in any future Office Action, Applicants respectfully request the rejection provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied reference, as required by MPEP 2112 IV. Further, any subsequent Office Action should be made **non-final** to give Applicants an opportunity to review the Office's position as to these arguments and to clarify the record for appeal. Absent further support for the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Bruckman.

Further, the Office Action fails to demonstrate how Inada, compensates for the deficiencies of Bruckman.

Accordingly, claim 6 should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features are recited by dependent claim 12, with potentially differing scope and breadth, the rejection of claim 12 should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 1, 2008 By: _____

David J. Cutitta
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501